

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Martin Cannon's Website: <http://www.crosswinds.net/portland/~visitation/cannon/>

Martin Cannon has been a Mind Control Researcher for over 15 years. He is most known for his article [The Controllers](#)

The central premise is that ufo abductions are CIA experiments. All facets of mind control are covered, including programmed assassins and agents, and remote electro-magnetic control of non-consenting experimentees.

Other Articles by Martin Cannon:

[MIND CONTROL & ABDUCTIONS](#) *by Martin Cannon*

[THE PRE-HISTORY OF MKULTRA](#) *by Martin Cannon*

[Project Monarch: The Tangled Web](#) *by Martin Cannon*

[ROSWELL: Truth and Consequences](#) *by Martin Cannon*

Session Start: Sat Sep 12 1998

< skygypsy> Good evening everyone.

< skygypsy> This is a Moderated meeting . /Msg Angela or c8- to be placed on Question List. DO NOT DCC THEM. For Discussing Please join #Visitations2 . DO NOT DCC or /msg The Speaker or I as we will be busy. To do so will be considered attempted flood.

< MC-> Two second lag. Much better.

< MC-> All right, am I on? Are we starting?

< skygypsy> Good Evening Martin! We welcome you this evening :))

< skygypsy> Please, go ahead :)

< MC-> OK, since this is a small meeting, and I was kind of a last minute decision, we are going to be quite informal.

< MC-> I presume that most of you have read "Controllers" or at least have heard of the thesis.

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< skygypsy> Martin, you are in moderated mode, and won't be taken out of it

< MC-> OK

< Angela-> *SickB* Hello, do you regret the hypothesis in 'The Controllers' that

a technology exists to implant voices and control signals in peoples' heads remotely without prior mechanical receivers installed? To what extent do you think that your paper contributed to the 'new wave' of people claiming to be controlled? Do you think that *any* genuine victims of this treatment can accurately recall what happened to them?

< MC-> I am glad you asked that question right up front.

< MC-> Yes, I regret every day having written that piece.

< MC-> I am glad that I contributed new ideas to ufology, and I am glad that some abduction researchers looked at the phenomenon in a new way.

< MC-> But at the same time a lot of mentally ill people now claim to be "wavies"...that is, victims of mind control

< MC-> By the way you will have to forgive my typing. I can type well, or type fast, but not both!

< MC-> At any rate

< MC-> I know that folks tell me I am not responsible for how my writings are misused by those with psychological problems.

< MC-> But frankly, there is already too much madness in the world, and I greatly fear that I have contributed to it. So in a moral sense, this business is a real poser.

< MC-> ?

< Angela-> Do you feel aliens are a factor in abductions? How much weight do you put into the idea that beings from outer space are abducting people?

< MC-> I am also glad you asked THAT one.

< MC-> One of the problems with presenting my thesis...or ANY thesis in ufology...is the "all or nothing" approach.

< MC-> I merely presented controllers as ONE theory which might explain SOME cases.

< MC-> I never asked anyone to exclude the ETH.

< MC-> The only thing I have ever said was that I do not think we should accept the ETH as a given.

< MC-> This is what separates me from both the Skeptics and the Believers, for whom the ETH is either a doctrine of faith or a heresy to be attacked.

< MC-> It is simply a theory. It should be neither thrown out nor embraced whole-heartedly.

< MC-> This leads us to the more interesting question: To what degree have ufology and the related "discipline" of "Conspiratology" become substitute religions for a faithless age?

< MC-> We can address that one if you like....

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> please do :)

< MC-> Actually, perhaps later on I would like to hear the thoughts of others on

that subject.

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< MC-> I do know that the people who become attached to one particular idea in these fields often display a fervor that we normally would associate with Torquemada and the Inquisition.

< MC-> ??

< Angela-> *Ken26* With a solid background experience, you can reword your paper to mean exactly what people are expecting to hear from you. For example, you can add the mental disorder problems reflected with the experiment victims and maybe add other people's facts, like from Psychologists or Psychiatrists.

< MC-> Ken, is there more, or should I address what you have said?

< Angela-> that's all

< MC-> Yes, I can do that...but to what end? I am skeptical that anything worthwhile would be accomplished.

< MC-> I mean, how do you tell the difference between a manufactured madman and the real thing?

< MC-> On the other hand, I have encountered cases which I believe are quite good.

< MC-> Candy Jones, whom I had the privilege of interviewing before she died, provides a good case in point.

< MC-> As many of you may know, she had a book written about her MKULTRA claims in 1975.

< MC-> The more I looked into her case, the better it got.

< MC-> She named (privately, not in the book) her CIA "spy"-psychiatrist: William Kroger.

< MC-> I recently have acquired evidence . first hand, that Kroger really did do atrocious behavior control experiments at the V.A. center near UCLA.

< MC-> That fact, and a number of others, led me to believe that Candy was telling the truth...that she really was a victim of a CIA experiment in hypnosis.

< MC-> But...some say that she was, personally, an unreliable individual.

< MC-> That her behavior was erratic.

< MC-> Perhaps so.

< MC-> And perhaps this erratic behavior was the RESULT of what she had gone through.

< MC-> I am willing to make this leap of faith in her case, because it is backed up by other evidence.

< MC-> But what about the case of others, where all we have is the word of one individual who is acting...well...downright weird?

< MC-> It is hard to point out such an individual and say: "Well, there. She validates my theory."

< MC-> The unsupported word of one person is not enough to validate criminal

charges...as I wish the supporters of Ken Starr would realise!

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> *SickB* Has the response to 'The Controllers' made you think that maybe all abductions are in the minds of abductees with no common stimulus except other people's accounts of experiences?

< MC-> That is a fear I have....but...

< MC-> What can I say? Every so often one runs across a good case.

< MC-> For example, early in my field work I encountered a case that occurred near Pacific Ocean, in Coral Canyon.

< MC-> A multiple event.

< MC-> It had happened years earlier, before abductions became big news.

< MC-> I first encountered the female witness (who had become a stripper, believe it or not), and got her account.

< MC-> Later, I was able to track down her long-lost boyfriend, who was with her on the night in question.

< MC-> They both told stories that validated each other, even though they had not seen each other in ages.

< MC-> The man had a responsible professional job and did not want anything resembling publicity.

< MC-> He could not recall going into a ship, although she had elaborate memories along these lines. He simply recalled being mysteriously "knocked out."

< MC-> And he recalled seeing craft shortly before the experience took place.

< MC-> Now, unless there was SOME sort of external stimuli, how am I to account for a case like this?

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> c8- is next .. Please ask your question

< c8->

< Riverwind> What role if any do you believe the Internet plays in mind control?

< MC-> What a fascinating question!

< MC-> I fear that the role is, in my view, almost entirely negative.

< MC-> "Data" gets passed around via mailing lists.

< MC-> Of course, networking was common in the days before the net, and it worked efficiently, but it was much less rapid.

< MC-> Now, everything zips along at lightning speed, and I fear that information is often quite unreliable.

< MC-> Frauds have been perpetuated in cyberspace.

< MC-> Worse, highly easily-influenced individuals may attach themselves to stories that they encounter on the net...they recall what they read, to put it bluntly.

< MC-> One good example: On Lynne-Moss Sharman's DIF list, which is sent to

many mind control victims, one person recalled being abused and "hypnotized" by Aleister Crowley, the infamous magician, during her childhood in the late 1950s.

< MC-> The moment she made this claim, others of a similar age "recalled" the same thing, or similar things.

< MC-> Of course, Crowley DIED in 1949.

< MC-> The moment THAT fact was brought to the attention of the DIF list, they came up with a rationalization:

< MC-> Crowley had travelled through time!

< MC-> Seems to me if Crowley had mastered time travel, he would have come back with a list of winning sports scores.

< MC-> Instead, he died poor.

< MC-> So that amusing little anecdote explains ONE of the dangers of the net.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> How would you compare the "early days" of Ufology to the state of Ufology today?

< MC-> I recently rad a book called "Flying Saucers Over Los Angeles" which was written in 1950. An excelllent overview of the subject.

< MC-> I have to say, it made the early days seem heavenly compared to what is going on now.

< MC-> That is pretty much the impression I would get from taliing to old hands like Fred Beckman and Jacques Vallee, both of whom worked intimately with Hynek.

< MC-> And other old school fellows, such as Bob Durant and Jim Moseley.

< MC-> They tended to have thier heads screwed on a little straighter.

< MC-> At the same time, they also tended to be wiser than others in the 1950s regarding abuses by intelligence agencies. Ufologists then knew what the NSA was, for example. At the time, almost nobody else had heard of the agency.

< MC-> I tend to think the work being done then was admirable, and I wish we could revert to those standards.

< MC-> Alas, nowadays there is far too much paranoia, suspicion and name calling.

< MC-> Worse, few people are even interested anymore in mere sightings.

< MC-> So nothing gets really researched unless it has "sex appeal."

< MC-> MUFON does many good things, but frankly, nearly every case that Walt Andrus draws attention to turns out to be a dog.

< MC-> I am in the minority in that I nevr liked the Roswell case, nor the Gulf Breeze case.

< MC-> Meanwhile, UFO reports happen ALL THE TIME which NO-ONE pays any attention!

< MC-> and attention TO, I should have said.

< MC-> Again, this issue of the standards now vs. the standards then is something I would like to hear about from others, when we open up for general discussion.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> SickB is next .. Please ask your question'

< skygypsy> Does +SickB have a question?

< MC-> Perhaps he's sick...?

< skygypsy> we will come back to him

< Angela-> I'll post it

< Angela-> *SickB* Are you willing to make the leap of faith and say that all abductions are like that and that the good cases are just noise?

< MC-> No.

< MC-> I've been in this ten years, and frankly, I am LESS prone to make categorical statements than when I started.

< MC-> Here is what I would like to see:

< MC-> Abduction researchers paying attention to the background of the subjects they interview.

< MC-> Whether the subejcts came from a military family, for example.

< MC-> Here on Visitations, They ahve found that a surprisingly large number of abductees come from military families.

< MC-> I think that this is important. Although I am NOT saying I know for sure what this means.

< MC-> Another simple question to ask abductees: Have they ever been hypnotised before?

< MC-> This is something you should ask ANY hypnotic sunject, even if that person is being hypnotised just to stop smoking. Yet Hopkins and Jacobs anbd that crowd never ask this simple question.

< MC-> When that question WAS asked of one of Jacobs' subjects (asked by Fred Beckman) the response was quite surprising!

< MC-> Other abductees have a surprising background in covert operations.

< MC-> For example, Mr. S...an abductee who was featured prominently in Hopkins' "Missing Time" met with me priveately.

< MC-> He told me that he had an intelligence background, and had once seen the "real" JFK autopsy photos.

< MC-> I think Hopkins should have made this sort of info public.

< MC-> Either it undermines the credibility of his claimant, or, if genuine, it places that claimant's abductionscenario in an entirely new light.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> What in your mind constitutes a Good Abduction Case?

< MC-> Huh! Interesting question.

< MC-> You know, I tend to make seat-of pants judgments...but I realise that that is not the best way to proceed.

< MC-> Basically, I don't like to see outward signs of schizophrenia or some other sort of emotional instability.

< MC-> I don't like to see a mindless parroting of the details to be found in UFO abduction books.

< MC-> I dislike any individual who seems to thrive on attention.

< MC-> Most reasonable individuals seem to understand that any writer or researcher can give only so much of his time to any one case.

< MC-> If a claimant starts to demand TOO much time and attention, I get suspicious.

< MC-> Finally, there is the manipulation factor.

< MC-> Let me be real blunt here:

< MC-> Many abductees are female.

< MC-> I am male. Tears have an effect on most males.

< MC-> When someone turns on the waterworks because I have tried to ask a penetrating question, I can in fact be manipulated. In the short run. In the LONG run, I become resentful.

< MC-> This, in fact, is one of the factors that led to my disaffection from doing research.

< MC-> I am sorry if that offended anyone. I realise that the subject is an emotional one for many people, and sometimes it is in fact natural for tears to flow while recalling an upsetting event.

< MC-> At the same time, the claimant should understand MY natural disinclination to let someone "yank my chain."

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> gunmaker is next .. Please ask your question

< gunmaker> All the negatives you cited concerning the net are true in any circumstance. On the net, aren't they offset by exposure to the plethora of varied memes?

< MC-> Well, that is hard to say

< MC-> If by memes you mean points of view, or scenarios, then yes, you are right.

< MC-> But then that simply leads to the creation of "ghettos" that various claimants huddle into.

< MC-> The Satanic Ritual Abuse victims hobble off to the SRA ghetto. The UFO abductees go into their space-case ghetto.

< MC-> The mind control claimants have their own ghettos of course.

< MC-> And these ghettos are served by an intranet, of sorts, directed to that particular world-view.

< MC-> Thus, the claimants became more firmly enmeshed in the idea that there can be only ONE explanation for the phenomenon. If these people were to compare notes, and open their minds...

< MC-> who knows? We might actually GET somewhere!

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> c8- is next .. Please ask your question

< c8-> for yelorse :Question for Martin - How do you tell a genuine mind-control victim from a "mind control" wannabe? And, why do you think anyone would want to believe they are a mind control victim when they are not? What needs do you think that role fulfills?

< MC-> Yelorse, that is the problem. I CAN'T tell.

< MC-> And this is the issue that weighs on me.

< MC-> Think of it as a rather harsh choice facing any researcher faced with a new claimant:

< MC-> The researcher can vote only one of two ways, in the final analysis.

< MC-> Thumbs up, or thumbs down.

< MC-> If he votes thumbs up, and he votes wrong, then he has aided some poor beleaguered person in his or her delusion.

< MC-> If he votes thumbs down, and he is wrong, then the researcher has inadvertently helped to perpetuate a victim's abuse.

< MC-> Really, the decision is quite an onerous one. Which is why I no longer care to be faced with that decision.

< MC-> However, I would like to hear from the others how THEY would resolve that conundrum.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> c8- is next .. Please ask your question

< c8-> *Riverwind* It seems the new breed of ufologists conduct the bulk of their research into UFOs and abduction solely on the Net and IRC. Do you feel this type of "research" can accomplish anything of value to ufology in general?

< MC-> Excellent point, Riverwind.

< MC-> The short answer is NO.

< MC-> How can you determine the veracity, the believability, of someone you have only known via the net?

< MC-> Hell, some famous figures on the net may not even exist...."Col. Steve Wilson" for example!

< MC-> Now, on IRC, you DO get to know a person well, over a period of time. And in those instances, I would say a measure of trust can properly be built up.

< MC-> But for the most part, it is imperative to meet with someone face to face, note the family background, body language, and all of that.

< MC-> Usenet is a joke.

< MC-> All flames, no information!

< MC-> Think about it: How many "name" ufologists do you see on the newsgroups?

< MC-> Do we see Jerry Clark there? Hopkins, Friedman, Strieber, Randle, ANYONE?

< MC-> Occasionally perhaps. But for the most part they see no use in usenet.

< MC-> So who struts around in that particualr chicken coop?

< MC-> Well, last time I looked, there were many posts from a guy claiming to be Gary Stollman...the same Gary Stollman, allegeldy, who held a reporter in Los Angeles at gunpoint and made him read a nutty screed over the air, live.

< MC-> And then we have folks like Brian Zeiler, from the "I live to hate" brigade.

< MC-> I had one guy named Reiker recently accuse me on usenet of being an evil gummint spook because I din't believe in the Philadelphi Experiment, and once had lunch with Jacques Vallee!

< MC-> THAT is the sort of person who has taken over usenet.

< MC-> It's not a forum. It's an asylum.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Martin, would you like to take a break at this time? A short break?

< MC-> give me a min.

< skygypsy> that is fine - everyone stand up and shift your weight a bit :)))

< skygypsy> about one minute, everyone :)

< MC-> Let me say one further thing about the newsgroups:

< MC-> Perhaps the flame wars are culturally determined.

< MC-> I have been spending a goodly amount of time, in recent days, on the alt.conspiracy.princess-diana newsgroup.

< MC-> There are many unusual ideas being discussed over there, and many of them are really quite silly.

< MC-> But at least they are discussed in a (mostly) civilized, flame-free environment.

< MC-> Perhaps because most of the participants are BRITISH!

< MC-> So, even though I am not a huge Diana fan, I tend to gravitate toward that group of people...because I simply feel more comfortable around stuck-up, repressed Englishmen.

< MC-> Lord knows what that may say about ME...!

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> *Ken26* How many times a month or year do you write up a report or research on a mind control victim?

< MC-> Not at all, lately.

< MC-> My last spate of hard-core research occurred in the summer of 1996.

< MC-> I was preparing a full-length book.

< MC-> It was to be around 25 chapter long.

< MC-> Alas, I had an absolutely disastrous hard-drive crash.

< MC-> And I had not backed up much of the book.

< MC-> Months later, I did find a back up copy of twelve early chapters.

< MC-> But there was some brand-spanking-new research that went up in cyber-flames, detailing the stories of fascinating people like the (now-deceased) Ann Livingston.

< MC-> Should I attempt to reconfigure the lost manuscript?

< skygypsy> heartbreaking, but I think we would all agree, YES!

< MC-> Alas, shortly afterward I decided that my experience had been so unhappy, dealing with some of the difficult and unsavory individuals in this field, that I decided simply to go on to other projects.

< MC-> Frankly, I had become completely cynical...until I came here.

< MC-> Angela and the others have been absolutely wonderful.

< MC-> Kind of restores one's faith in Fortean, it does...!

< MC-> so...maybe? WHO knows?

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> c8- is next .. Please ask your question

< c8->

< Riverwind> Claims of abduction or mind control attempts that fall outside the generally accepted "norm" of these phenomenon tend to be disregarded without investigation. Do you feel that this is a dangerous practice?

< MC-> Absolutely.

< MC-> Worse, important and famous cases have been presented in an entirely inadequate fashion to the public because of the pro-ETH bias held by many researchers.

< MC-> I would not ask those researchers to abandon the ETH, merely to abandon the "editing" of the accounts told by the claimants.

< MC-> Famous example:

< MC-> Myrna Hansen, the abductee who more or less started the entire "Bennewitz affair."

< MC-> Hansens' case is, I believe, quite a good one for anyone researching the hypothesis outline in Controllers.

< MC-> If you look at her original statement, you'll see that she was NOT saying that she was abducted by aliens!

< MC-> Instead, she said -- CLEARLY -- that she was abducted by military personnel, on the outskirts of Kirtland AFB!

< MC-> Although much has been written about the Bennewitz affair, absolutely NO-ONE has published this all-important fact, which changes the complexion of this entire case.

< MC-> I spoke to Leo Sprinkle., who helped investigate the case.

< MC-> He basically admitted that Bennewitz' pro-ETH prejudice had completely colored the entire investigation.

< MC-> Hansen later "recalled" aliens...but only after months of close contact with Bennewits, who was downright fanatical on the subject.

< MC-> Because alternative hypothesis did not even occur to the investigators, an entirely misleading "read" of the case has gone on the record.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> Some people talk about "logical pregressions of technology" (making assumptions that applied for patents and proposals for research progressed at a rate that was comparable to microtechnology for example) to support their claims that these advanced devices for electronic mindreading, brainwave transference, electronic harassment, etc. are responsible for much of the abduction scenarios/mind-control we see. What is your opinion about this?

< MC-> On one hand iw ould say...it is possible.

< MC-> On the other hand, the wavies have rendered me suspicious and cynical about such claims.

< MC-> "Wavies," as many of you might know, are those who have made claims that they hear "voices" fromtherie CIA mind controllers.

< MC-> SOme say that the voices occur on a 24 hour a day basis.

< MC-> Such claims, I am persuaded, are the result of schizophrenia.

< MC-> Yes, it is indeed posble (as James C. Linn, the damed microwave scientist, recently admitted) to use microwave technology to modulate the human voice.

< MC-> I also believe that this has been done.

< MC-> But to mount a 24 a day operation against some unimportant shlub...well, one has to ask, WHY?

< MC-> Now, some people are simply ultra sensitive to EMF emissions.

< MC-> I know, for example, the Dr. Elizabeth Rauscher, who also has great expertise in these fields, has expored some "wavie" claims first hand.

< MC-> SHe found that in some case, the individuasl were living next to poorly-shielded sources of high EMF energy, which altered their perceptions and behavior.

< MC-> Such fields may not have any effect on the average person.

< MC-> But some have a greater than average sensitivity.

< MC-> SO the answer was "electronic pollution," not a CIA plot.

< MC-> That may also be one of the answers in the case of Kathy Davis, who was the subject of Budd Hopkins' "Inturders."

< MC-> An electronics wiz named Nick Reiter befriended Kathie and set up an experiment.

< MC-> He basically installed a "microwave detector" in her home. It was more

or less a jerry-rigged police radar detector device.

< MC-> detector, I should say. Many apologies for the spelling!

< MC-> At any rate, the damn thing was going off day and night. Finally, Kathie had to take it out.

< MC-> The question is: WHAT was the source of "microwave pollution"?

< MC-> She lived, and probably still lives, in a rural area. Reitere could never find exactly what was setting the damn thing off.

< MC-> But my gut instinct tells me that something "in the air" has had a great effect on the "Intruders" case.

< MC-> And Kathie may NOT have been a true alien abductee -- nor a victim of "mind control." She may merely be sensitive in ways that most of us are not.

< MC-> Her real name, by the way, is Debbie Jordan, if I recall correctly.

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> *Ken26* Can you recall your first research or article on mind control that led you to your quest on this?

< MC-> Yes.

< MC-> I read a couple of books in rapid succession. One of them was Striebers' "Communion."

< MC-> The other was the aforementioned Candy Jones book.

< MC-> I noticed odd similarities between the two accounts...there were little-noticed passages in Strieber's book which seem to have nothing to do with aliens, yet much to do with apparent espionage-type operations.

< MC-> I wondered, why would Strieber (if he were a mere hoaxer, as many then suspected) include those details, which did nothing to help his credibility, and which seemed to come from the world of Ian Fleming?

< MC-> His book simply seemed to parallel Candy's.

< MC-> Shortly after this, I got hold of Vallee's Messengers of Deception.

< MC-> This book was probably the first to mention anything like the "mind control" hypothesis, as applied to abductions. It talks about MKULTRA...but VERY briefly.

< MC-> The theory was mentioned en passant. Someone needed to flesh it out.

< MC-> I volunteered for the job.

< MC-> I recall distinctly the night I first mentioned this little research project to the woman I was then living with.

< MC-> Her crestfallen face said: Oh no. There goes the relationship!

< MC-> But I was determined to investigate, so I went off to D.C. where I went through the files of released MKULTRA documents compiled by John Marks.

< MC-> There, I found that the CIA had indeed experimented with miniature intercranial implants.

< MC->]This reminded me of the most famous pieces of "evidence" mentioned

in the abduction books.

< MC-> SO I could not help but wonder: Is it not possible that the fault lies not in our stars, but in ourselves?

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> c8- is next .. Please ask your question

< c8->

< Riverwind> What would be the motivation for military abductions, in your opinion?

< MC-> The question of motive comes up time and again. The short answer is: I don't know.

< MC-> I think there is NO motive, in the classic sense of "We are going to control THIS person so that a year from now, she will perform function XYZ..."

< MC-> Instead, I think that this is genuine experimentation.

< MC-> You see, over the years, I have tentatively concluded that some forms of mind control do exist...but they don't work well.

< MC-> They don't work on everyone, only on select personality types.

< MC-> And there is a limit to what hypnosis and other modalities can accomplish.

< MC-> So that is the motive for continued research. IF (and this is a big if) my theory is correct, then people are chosen for no other reason than their availability.

< MC-> For example, someone who grew up on military bases (as many abductees have done) would have been treated by military doctors.

< MC-> These doctors may have been able to determine whether the child in question was the proper psychological or physical type...whether the subject rated highly, for example, on the hypnotizability scale.

< MC-> If so, then such a subject would be tracked for life.

< MC-> And eventually might find himself subjected to the latest "breakthrough" in mind control technology.

< MC-> That, at least, was my theory.

< MC-> Finding "good" cases to prove the theory proved to be quite difficult...as I have already related!

< MC-> ??

< skygypsy> Angela- is next .. Please ask your question

< Angela-> Do you have any more info about Cathy O'Brian since you wrote: "Project Monarch: The Tangled Web"?

< MC-> Yes, and I really ought to write an update of that work.

< MC-> In short, I spoke at length to Cathy's former husband, Alex Houston, and I am now convinced that the whole Monarch case is a fraud, and that her current paramour is a dangerous individual.

< MC-> That paramour being Mark Phillips.

< MC-> He apparently is himself a very gifted self-taught hypnotist.

< MC-> I heard one story which is worht relating:
< MC-> Cathy, early on, went into a Tennessee police station and told the entire story of how she had been abused by the Monarch project.
< MC-> She said that her body had been marked by cuts and electroshock, and that her vagina had been mutilated by her abusers.
< MC-> So the cops brought in a female to examine her.
< MC-> SHe had no marks, and no mutilated vagina.
< MC-> The freaky thing was this:
< MC-> Cathy pointed to various areas on her body and said, quite upset, "See? Here? Don't you see the marks?"
< MC-> SHe pointed to invisible "wounds" ...and seemed to believe sincerely that they were real!
< MC-> Now THAT story gave me the heebie jeebies when first I heard it. But hypnosis is an extremely powerful technique, which should never be employed by amateurs, or by conscienceless con-men like Mark Phillips.
< MC-> At this point, I think perhaps we should open things up?
< MC-> I mean to a general discussion...
< MC-> ??
< skygypsy> If that is what you would like, of course! Thank you Martin!
< Angela-> *Ken26* There are people that have a form of epileptic seizures which people have "voices" and "alternate realities", so schitzophrenia isn't the only medical term for this?
< Angela-> had one more to go :)
< skygypsy> we are out of moderation - Angela, go ahead
< MC-> OK. I'll address it briefly.
< MC-> What can I say, Ken, excpet you are right?
< MC-> Joan of Arc heard voices. SOphocles heard his "daimon."
< MC-> AND yet these people behaved in an otherwise more or less normal fashion.
< MC-> So schizophrenis is really a misleading catch all term. We still don't understand the human mind...but you knew that already!
< MC-> Anyways, I would liek to hear form others: What do youthink would be the criteria for a "good" abduction case? Or mind control case?
< skygypsy> The channel is now open for general discussion. The Official Log ends.
Session Close: Sat Sep 12 1998

[Back](#)